

### Remarks

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Claims 5-11, 14-22, and 25-26 are indicated as having allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 3, 6-10, 12-13, 15, 20-23, and 26 have been amended. Claims 2, 5, 14, and 25 have been cancelled. Reconsideration and re-examination of the application is respectfully requested.

1. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,267,617 issued to Nozick.

Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the claim limitations of dependant claim 5, which has been indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims, and intervening claim 2. Claims 2 and 5 have been cancelled. Because all of the claim limitations of claim 5 and its intervening claims have been added to claim 1, Nozick does not teach all of the claim limitations of claim 1. Removal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 6-10, and 12 have been amended to correct claim dependency in view of the aforementioned amendment. Claims 3-4 depend from independent claim 1. As previously discussed, Nozick does not teach all the claim limitations of amended claim 1. Because Nozick does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 1, Nozick does not teach all the claim limitations of claims 3-4. Removal of the rejection of claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

2. The Examiner has rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 4,972,575 issued to Frantz et al.

Claim 13 has been amended to include all of the claim limitations of dependant claim 14, which has been indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 14 has been cancelled. Because all of the claim limitations of claim 14 and its intervening claims have been added to claim 13, Frantz et al. does not teach all of the claim limitations of claim 13. Removal of the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 15 and 20-22 have been amended to correct claim dependency in view of the aforementioned amendment.

3. The Examiner has rejected claims 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 4,972,575 issued to Frantz et al.

Claim 23 has been amended to include all of the claim limitations of dependant claim 25, which has been indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 25 has been cancelled. Because all of the claim limitations of claim 25 and its intervening claims have been added to claim 23, Frantz et al. does not teach all of the claim limitations of claim 23. Removal of the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claim 26 has been amended to correct claim dependency in view of the aforementioned amendment. Claim 24 depends from independent claim 23. As previously discussed, Frantz et al. does not teach all the claim limitations of amended claim 23. Because Frantz et al. does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 23, Frantz et al. does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 24. Removal of the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

4. The Examiner has rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,267,617 issued to Nozick in view of US Patent No. 5,624,274 issued to Lin.

Claim 12 depends from independent claim 1. As previously discussed, claim 1 has been amended to include all of the claim limitations of dependant claim 5, which has been indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Because Nozick does not teach all of the claim limitations of claim 1, the combination of Nozick in view of Lin does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of claim 12. Removal of the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the amendments and arguments presented herein, the application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and passage to issue is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Order Account No. 501581.

Respectfully submitted,  
Longinos De.Dios Martin, Applicant



Jennifer Mae Slonaker  
Registration No. 50568  
Attorney for Applicant  
Phone: 717.399.1535  
Facsimile: 717.291.4660